

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks and the application has been amended to more clearly define the invention. Claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-20 are presented in the application for further examination. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 14 and 16-20 have been amended by this Amendment C. Reconsideration of the application claims as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-14, and 16-20 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-14, and 16-20 as being unpatentable over Skinner, US Publication No. 2004/0107137 in view of Thomas (U.S. 6,401, 118) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants submit that each and every element as set forth in the recited claims, as amended, is not found in the combination of the Skinner and Thomas references. Thus, the cited references do not make the claims obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 3 relating to modifying the title by the host. As indicated by the Examiner during the interview process, the references do not teach title modification by the host so that claim 2 should be allowed. Claim 4 is patentable based at least on its dependency from claim 2.

Claim 1 has been similarly amended to indicate that the host manages access on the IWR to the information provided by the partner. In contrast, Skinner discloses an automated web ranking system for monitoring online marketing media and maximizing the effectiveness of advertising through banner ads, click-through search engines, links, affiliate programs and other advertising media. See Skinner, paragraphs [0011] and

[0035]. The system includes a tracking engine that records the date and time a user clicks on an advertiser's listing or banner ad. Skinner does not disclose an integrated web ring site wherein the host manages information provided by the partner. Thomas relates to searching and does not address IWR host management.

Claims 7, 14 and 16-20 have been similarly amended to indicate that the host is permitted to modify the link. As Skinner and Thomas do not address this aspect, claims 7, 14 and 16-20, and claims 8 and 10-13 depending from 7, are patentable.

In summary, the integrated web ring (IWR) sites specified in claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-14, and 16-20 are patentable over Skinner and Thomas because these references teach advertising tracking and searching. Skinner and Thomas do not disclose modifying the title, managing and modifying the link, as recited. Thus, Skinner and Thomas fail to disclose all the elements of the claims, as amended. For the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-14, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

II. Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 9 as being unpatentable over Skinner and Thomas in view of Knapp et al., US Patent No. 6,769,010.

Applicants submit that each and every element as set forth in claim 9, as amended, is not found in either the Skinner, Thomas or Knapp references, either taken separately or in combination. Thus, the cited references do not anticipate the claims. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9, as amended, depends from claim 7 which has been amended to indicate that the host is permitted to modify the

link. The Examiner cites Knapp as disclosing web pages with health information. However, Knapp does not address the host modifying the link. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

III. Rejection of Claims 5 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 15 as being unpatentable over Skinner in view of Knapp and further in view of Thomas. Claim 15 has been canceled. Claim 5 has been amended to include some of the subject matter of claim 6 and recites a "stated policy wherein the stated policy includes the candidate retail partner agreeing to provide searchable product information that can be screened or sorted by the host during a user product search according to predetermined user preferences relative to at least one of price and manufacturer identity." Since Skinner, Knapp and Thomas do not address IWR policy, claim 5 as amended should be allowed.

IV. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 4 as being unpatentable over Skinner and Thomas in view of Han (U.S. 2001/00448000). Claim 4 is patentable at least based on its dependency from claim 2, which the Examiner has previously indicated as allowable.

V. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 3 as being unpatentable over Skinner and Thomas in view of Pervival (U.S. 2004/0039795). As noted above, the Examiner indicated during the interview process that the references do not teach title modification by the host so that claim 2, which as been amended to include the subject matter of claim 3, should be allowed. Claim 3 has been canceled as redundant.

VI. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 6 as being unpatentable over Skinner, Thomas and Knapp in view of Barzilai et al. (U.S. 2002/0029201).

Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and patentable over Skinner, Knapp and Thomas for the reasons noted above regarding claim 5. Barzilai is deficient for the same reasons, namely, it fails to disclose the stated policy recited by claim 5. The Examiner argues that Barzilai discloses privacy policy agreements. However, claim 5 recites that "the stated policy includes the candidate retail partner agreeing to provide searchable product information that can be screened or sorted by the host during a user product search according to predetermined user preferences relative to at least one of price and manufacturer identity." Since Barzilai does not teach such a policy in the context of an IWR, claims 5 and 6 should be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-20 is requested. Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the claims as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400